Case 3:14-cr-00214-SI Document 2 Filed 04/18/14 Page 1 of 1

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

United States of America,) Case No. CR 14-214 CPB
Plaintiff, v.	STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING TIME UNDER THE SPEED RAD, ACT
Jessne Leuris	APR 18 2014
Defendant.	RICHARD W. WIEKING CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
Speedy Trial Act from $\frac{4/18}{1}$, 2014 to the continuance outweigh the best interest of 3161(h)(7)(A). The Court makes this finding a	ord on $\frac{9/18}{5/7}$, 2014, the Court excludes time under the so $\frac{5/7}{7}$, 2014 and finds that the ends of justice served of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § and bases this continuance on the following factor(s):
See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i	yould be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice.
defendants, the nature of or law, that it is unreasonable to	nplex, due to [check applicable reasons] the number of the prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial blished by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).
	of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).
	yould unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given commitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.
_	rould unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time on, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.
IT IS SO ORDERED.	
DATED: 4/18/14	JACQUELINE SCOTT CORLEY NUND OF T VAILUS United States Magistrate Judge
STIPULATED: Attorney for Defendan	t Assistant United States Attorney